Evaluation Form Rubric/Score Sheet for Continued Ed Tech Funding

Name of LEA:				Final Total:

REVIEWERS: Remember that all projects don't end until June 30th. Some projects might be in the middle of their project year and have not accomplished all goals and objectives. The projects were instructed to state what has been accomplished to date, and what will be accomplished by the end of the project year. This is based on their application that was funded. Hopefully the applicant did a good job of separating what still needs to be done with what has been accomplished. **Score this sheet separately from the rest of the package and enter the total at the top.**

Question from Evaluation Form	Reflective Questions when scoring	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point
1. **Describe the level to which the goals and objectives have been accomplished with any and all previous ED TECH funding.**	Check the goals and objectives listed in last year's application (copy included) to align with their answer for this question. Make sure they aren't just providing a good answer that can't be backed up or wasn't addressed. **Sometimes there are obstacles that prevent complete compliance so use good judgment.**	All goals and objectives met and accomplished according to plan. If not, very valid reasons for not completing all were provided.	All goals and objectives were not accomplished, and the reason(s) provided for non-compliance were not valid enough to merit full points.	Answers were too vague. Past history not provided in tech plan. No alignment with past history and answer to this question.
	Reflective Questions when scoring	**3 Points**	**2 Points**	**1 Point**
2. **Describe the results, in detail, of the evaluations called for in the grant application.**	The LEA provides a clear picture of what happened during their project year, as determined by the various evaluation methods they used.	Good, clear description of project results, based on the evaluations called for in the grant application.	Adequate description of project results, based on the evaluations called for in the grant application.	Description of project results are vague and not aligned to the evaluations used.
	Reflective Questions when scoring	**3 Points**	**2 Points**	**1 Point**
3. **What evaluation instruments were used to evaluate accomplishments? Describe results and all associated information.**	Were the evaluation methods adequate to gauge progress or provide feedback? How well did they document success? Answer needs to align with what they said they would do to evaluate their project.	The evaluation methods were very adequate and provided measurable feedback. Results of evaluations show success in project implementation. Answer aligns to evaluation section of project.	The evaluation methods were adequate but lacked details on successful implementation. Or, if evaluation methods were adequate and provided clear detailed results, they didn't completely align to project.	Evaluation methods were not adequate. Details were vague or generic. No alignment to project evaluation.
	Reflective Questions when scoring	**3 Points**	**2 Points**	**1 Point**
4. **How many teachers, support staff, administrators, students and parents participated in professional development activities? Provide breakdown for each category.**	Check the amount spent for professional development. Does the amount of funding justify the numbers trained and the benefits gained? Was the money well spent?	Shows a clear alignment to the goals and objectives for professional development. Complete details are provided for each category and meet project goals.	Shows somewhat clear alignment to goals and objectives, but details are vague meeting project goals.	Alignment to goals, objectives and needs assessment not clearly defined. Details vague or incomplete.
Question from Evaluation Form	**Reflective Questions when scoring**	**3 Points**	**2 Points**	**1 Point**
5. **How many professional development sessions were held? Total sessions, total hours?**	Check their professional development goals. Did they make good use of their funds for the number of sessions and hours they received?	Complete details provided on sessions and hours. Total alignment of approved funding year(s).	Details provided on sessions and hours, but reviewer does not agree that the funds support the outcomes.	Did not substantiate that high-quality professional development was provided.
	Reflective Questions when scoring	**3 Points**	**2 Points**	**1 Point**

6. **What were the topics of the professional development sessions?**	For continued funding the topics should be way beyond basics. How adequate are the topics in curriculum integration and meeting state academic standards? BUT use your judgment and look at the demographics - charter schools and rural sites might just be at the beginning levels of technology.	Topics are adequate, considering the demographics of the site, and provide a versatile offering towards professional growth and lead to a technologically literate staff.	Adequate topics considering the demographics, but difficult to determine whether they will provide professional growth or lead to a technologically literate staff.	Topics are not adequate considering the demographics of the site and will most likely not lead to professional growth or to a technologically literate staff.
	Reflective Questions when scoring	**3 Points**	**2 Points**	**1 Point**
7. **What products were created as a result of funded professional development under ED TECH (such as: training materials, lesson plans, assessment or evaluation instruments, thematic units, best practices, projects, etc.)? Include one document in electronic format with your application package.**	LEA instructed to submit materials in electronic format, but they should answer this question and detail what they are submitting. We did ask for details that pertained to **ED TECH funded** professional development. The Lead Reviewer for each Team will get the electronic file and be able to provide a copy and feedback to the rest of the team members before the Team Review on the 21st.	The documents, projects, lesson plans, assessment or evaluation instruments, classroom models and materials created as a result of ED TECH funded professional development are clearly detailed and described. The sample submitted shows a high quality product created as a result of the funding.	The materials created as a result of ED TECH funded professional development are described in some detail. Given that Ed Tech requires high-quality professional development, the LEA failed to provide a sample that reflects this.	The materials created as a result of ED TECH funded professional development are not described, or materials created are below an acceptable level.
	Reflective Questions when scoring	**3 Points**	**2 Points**	**1 Point**
8. **Could your project be used as a model and could it be replicated by another district with few modifications?**	Remember that with Ed Tech, for-profit partnerships are strongly encouraged, so not all projects will be able to be replicated, especially if a copyrighted product is used as the basis for the project.	LEA clearly supports why others can or cannot replicate and provides some suggested modifications to the areas that might need to be modified for replication. Or N/A Project not type that can be replicated.	Supports why others can replicate this project but lacks details or specifics.	Not clear whether project can be replicated or not.
	Reflective Questions when scoring	**3 Points**	**2 Points**	**1 Point**
9. **What instructional impact has already been noted through the implementation of the plan?**	Did the LEA provide a clear concise answer on how they gauged the impact of ED TECH funding? Was the impact clearly described and measurable? Did ED TECH funding make a difference?	LEA provided a clear description of what instructional impact has been noted through the implementation of the project.	Provided a somewhat clear description of what instructional impact has been noted through the implementation of the project	Description of instructional impact was very vague.
	Reflective Questions when scoring	**3 Points**	**2 Points**	**1 Point**
10. **How did receiving the ED TECH grant help the district in the implementation of the project?**	There should be some specific outcomes in this answer. What benefits were gained as a result of funding?	LEA provided a clear and concise description of how Ed Tech funds assisted in the implementation of project.	Provided a somewhat clear description of how Ed Tech funds assisted in the implementation of project	Provided a vague description of how the Ed Tech assisted in the implementation of project.
	Reflective Questions when scoring	**3 Points**	**2 Points**	**1 Point**

11. Activities Table described in the grant application (whether completed or not).	Activities should include all that will lead to project implementation. Again, read past history to see what they said they were going to do in previous year to lead towards implementation of project. They should also have a clear picture of where they are going in terms of technology in the Next Steps. There are 3 parts to the answer.	LEA provides a clear picture of what activities were planned to implement project. Clearly describes the current status and what they accomplished. Shows a clear understanding of what they need to do to continue to progress toward project implementation.	LEA provided clear answers to 2 of the 3 columns, but failed to clearly describe all 3.	LEA did not provide a clear picture of the project activities, nor did they provide a clear description of current status, nor show that they understand what the next steps are.